

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Emma Jane Heatley

Application No.: 10/526,668

Filed: March 4, 2005

For: CLEANING APPLIANCE

Conformation No.: 3153

Art Unit: 3723

Examiner: Bryan R. Muller

RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT

MS Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Action dated May 8, 2008, Applicant elects to prosecute species A and W, *with traverse*. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, 18 and 19 read on the elected species.

The reason Applicant traverses the election requirement is that it appears to be entirely unnecessary. The Examiner has found, correctly in Applicant's view, that all of the claims in this application are generic to species W-Z, meaning that the election of species requirement as to species W-Z is essentially meaningless. Furthermore, six of the nineteen claims in this application are generic to species A. Applicant does not wish to question any possible finding of patentable distinctness of species by the Examiner, as Applicant merely questions the necessity for the requirement as a matter of examining burden.